arXiv:0906.3055v1 [math.LO] 17 Jun 2009

# UNIFORMING $n$-PLACE FUNCTIONS ON $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$

ESTHER GRUENHUT AND SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. In this paper the Erdős-Rado theorem is generalized to the class of well founded trees. We define an equivalence relation on the class $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)^{<\aleph_0}$ ( finite sequences of decreasing sequences of ordinals) with $\aleph_0$ equivalence classes, and for $n < \omega$ a notion of $n$-end-uniformity for a colouring of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)^{<\aleph_0}$ with $\mu$ colours. We then show that for every ordinal $\alpha$, $n < \omega$ and cardinal $\mu$ there is an ordinal $\lambda$ so that for any colouring $c$ of $T = \mathrm{ds}(\lambda)^{<\aleph_0}$ with $\mu$ colours, $T$ contains $S$ isomorphic to $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ so that $c{\restriction}S^{<\aleph_0}$ is $n$-end uniform. For $c$ with domain $T^n$ this is equivalent to finding $S \subseteq T$ isomorphic to $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ so that $c{\restriction}S^n$ depends only on the equivalence class of the defined relation, so in particular $T \to (\mathrm{ds}(\alpha))^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$. We also draw a conclusion on colourings of $n$-tuples from a scattered linear order.

This paper is a natural continuation of [3] in which Shelah and Komjáth prove that for any scattered order type $\varphi$ and cardinal $\mu$ there exists a scattered order type $\psi$ such that $\psi \to [\varphi]^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$. This was proved by a theorem on colourings of well founded trees. By Hausdorff's characterization (see [2] and [4] ) every scattered order type can be embedded in a well founded tree, so we can deduce a natural generalization of their theorem to the $n$-ary case, i.e for every scattered order type $\varphi$, $n < \omega$, and cardinal $\mu$ there is a scattered order type $\psi$ such that $\psi \to (\varphi)^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$.

We start with a few definitions.

**Definition 1.** For an ordinal $\alpha$ we define $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha) = \{\eta : \eta$ a decreasing sequence of ordinals $< \alpha\}$. By $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ we mean the class of decreasing sequences of ordinals.

We say $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ is a tree when $T$ is non-empty and closed under initial segments. $T, S$ will denote trees. For $S \subseteq T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ we say that $S$ is a subtree of $T$ if it is also a tree. We use the following notation:

*Notation* 2.
1. For $\eta, \nu \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ by $\eta \cap \nu$ we mean $\eta{\restriction}\ell$ where $\ell$ is maximal such that $\eta{\restriction}\ell = \nu{\restriction}\ell$.
2. For $\eta \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and a tree $T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ we define

$$\eta^\frown T = \{\rho : \rho \trianglelefteq \eta \vee (\exists \nu \in T)(\rho = \eta^\frown \nu)\}$$

---

Research supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (Grant no. 2002323). Publication 909 in Shelah's archive.
AMS 200 classification 03E05, 05C15.
*Key words: Set Theory, partition relation, well founded trees, scattered order types.*

Note that for $\eta \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty \backslash \{\langle\rangle\})$ and $\{\langle\rangle\} \subsetneq T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ if $\eta(\lg(\eta)-1) > \sup\{\rho(0) : \rho \in T\}$ then $\eta^\frown T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$.

**Definition 3.** We define the following four binary relations on $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$:

1. Let $<^1_{\ell x}$ be the two place relation on $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ defined by $\eta <^1_{\ell x} \nu$ iff one of the following: $(\exists \ell)(\eta(\ell) < \nu(\ell)$ or $\eta \restriction \ell = \nu \restriction \ell)$ or $\eta \triangleleft \nu$.
2. Let $<^2_{\ell x}$ be the two place relation on $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ defined by $\eta <^2_{\ell x} \nu$ iff one of the following: $(\exists \ell)(\eta(\ell) < \nu(\ell)$ or $\eta \restriction \ell = \nu \restriction \ell)$ or $\nu \triangleleft \eta$.
3. $<^*_{\ell x} = <^1_{\ell x} \cap <^2_{\ell x}$.
4. Let $<^3$ be the two place relation on $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ defined by $\eta <^3 \nu$ iff one of the following: $\eta \triangleleft \nu$ or for the maximal $\ell$ such that $\eta \restriction \ell = \nu \restriction \ell$ if $\ell$ is even then $\eta(\ell) < \nu(\ell)$ and if $\ell$ is odd then $\eta(\ell) > \nu(\ell)$.

It is easily verified that $<^1_{\ell x}, <^2_{\ell x}$ and $<^3$ are complete orders of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, and therefore $<^*_{\ell x}$ is a partial order. The following remark refers to their order types defined by $<^1_{\ell x}, <^2_{\ell x}$ and $<^3$ on $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ or $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$.

**Observation 4.** (1) *$<^1_{\ell x}, <^2_{\ell x}$ are well orderings for* $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$.

(2) $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3)$ *is a scattered linear order type for every ordinal $\alpha$.*

(3) *Every scattered linear order type can be embedded in* $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3)$ *for some ordinal $\alpha$.*

*Proof.* (1) Let $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, we define by induction on $n < \omega$ an element $a_n$ in the following manner $a_0 = \min\{\eta(0) : \eta \in A\}$, assume $a_0, \cdots, a_{n-1}$ have been chosen so that $\langle a_k : k < n\rangle \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and for every $\eta \in A$ $\langle a_k : k < n\rangle \leq^2_{\ell x} \eta \restriction n$ (if $\lg(\eta) \leq n$ then $\eta \restriction n = \eta$). Now choose $a_n = \min\{\eta(n) : \eta \in A \wedge \eta \restriction n = \langle a_k : k < n\rangle\}$, if that set isn't empty. As the sequence derived in the above manner is a decreasing sequence of ordinals it is finite, say $a_0, \cdots a_{n-1}$ have been defined and $a_n$ cannot be defined, we will show that $\bar{a} = \langle a_k : k < n\rangle$ is the minimal element of $A$ with respect to $<^2_{\ell x}$. By the definition of the sequence there is an $\eta \in A$ so that $\eta \restriction n = \bar{a}$, if $\lg(\eta) > n$ then we could have defined $a_n$, so $\eta = \bar{a}$ and in particular $\bar{a} \in A$, and for every $\eta \in A \backslash \{\bar{a}\}$ we have $\bar{a} <^2_{\ell x} \eta$. Let $n_* = \min\{m : \bar{a} \restriction m \in A\}$ so $\bar{a} \restriction n_*$ is the minimal $<^1_{\ell x}$ element in $A$.

(2) The proof is by induction on $\alpha$. Assume that $(\mathrm{ds}(\beta), <^3)$ is a scattered linear order type for every $\beta < \alpha$, and assume towards contradiction that $\mathbb{Q}$ can be embedded in $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3)$, $q \mapsto \eta_q$. Let $C = \{\ell : (\exists p, q \in \mathbb{Q})(\eta_p(\ell) \neq \eta_q(\ell))\}$, $\ell = \min C$ and $\Gamma = \{\beta : (\exists q \in \mathbb{Q})(\eta_q(\ell) = \beta)\}$. Without loss of generality $\ell$ is even and for $\beta_0 = \min \Gamma$, $\beta_1 = \min \Gamma \backslash \{\beta_0\}$ there are $q_0 < q_1 \in \mathbb{Q}$ so that $\eta_{q_i}(\ell) = \beta_i$, $i = 0, 1$. Now $(q_0, q_1) = B_0 \cup B_1$ where $B_i = \{p \in (q_0, q_1) : \eta_p(\ell) = \beta_i\}$. For some $i \in \{0, 1\}$ the set $B_i$ contains an interval of $\mathbb{Q}$ and is embedded in $(\eta_{q_i} \restriction (\ell+1)^\frown \mathrm{ds}(\beta_i), <^3)$ but this would imply that $\mathbb{Q}$ can be embedded in $(\mathrm{ds}(\beta_i), <^3)$ which is a contradiction to the induction hypothesis.

(3) By Hausdorff's characterization it is enough to show for ordinals $\alpha$ and $\beta$ that both $A_{\alpha,\beta} = (\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3) \times \beta$ and $A_{\alpha,\beta^*} = (\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3) \times \beta^*$ can be embedded in $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha + \beta \cdot 2 + 1), <^3)$. The embedding is given as follows, for $(\eta, \gamma) \in A_{\alpha,\beta}$ we have $(\eta, \gamma) \mapsto \langle \alpha+\beta+\gamma+1, \alpha+\beta\rangle ^\frown \eta$, and for $(\eta, \gamma) \in A_{\alpha,\beta^*}$ we have $(\eta, \gamma) \mapsto \langle \alpha + \beta \cdot 2, \alpha + \beta + \gamma\rangle ^\frown \eta$.

$\square$

**Definition 5.** For trees $T_1, T_2 \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, $f : T_1 \to T_2$ is an embedding of $T_1$ into $T_2$ if $f$ preserves level, $\lhd$ and $<^1_{\ell x}$ (or equivalently, $<^2_{\ell x}, <^*_{\ell x}$ or $<^3$).

**Observation 6.** *For trees $T_1, T_2 \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, if $f : T_1 \to T_2$ preserves level and $\lhd$ then in order to determine whether $f$ is an embedding it is enough to check for $\eta \in T_1$ and ordinals $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ such that $\nu_i = \eta^\frown\langle\gamma_i\rangle \in T_1$ $(i = 1, 2)$ that $f(\nu_1) <^*_{\ell x} f(\nu_2)$.*

As $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ is well founded, i.e there are no infinite branches, it is natural to define a rank function. in the following definition $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}$ isn't the standard rank function but for $\mu = 1$ we get a similar definition to the usual definition of a rank on a well founded tree.

**Definition 7.** For a tree $T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and cardinal $\mu$ define $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta)$ : $\mathrm{ds}(\infty) \to \{-1\} \cup \mathrm{Ord}$ by induction on $\alpha$ as follows:

(a) $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq 0$ iff $\eta \in T$.
(b) $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \alpha + 1$ $\underline{\text{iff}}$ $\mu \leq |\{\gamma : \eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle \in T \wedge \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle) \geq \alpha\}|$.
(c) $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \delta$ limit $\underline{\text{iff}}$ $(\forall \alpha < \delta)(\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \alpha)$.

We say that $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) = \alpha$ iff $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \alpha$ but $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \not\geq \alpha + 1$.
Denote $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(T) = \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\langle\rangle)$, and $\mathrm{rk}_T(\eta) = \mathrm{rk}_{T,1}(\eta)$.

**Definition 8.** For a tree $T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, $\eta \in T$ and cardinals $\mu, \lambda$ we define the reduced rank $\mathrm{rk}^\lambda_{T,\mu}(\eta) = \min\{\lambda, \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta)\}$.

We first note a few properties of the rank function.

**Observation 9.** *For $\eta \in T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and an ordinal $\alpha$ we have:*

(1) *For cardinals $\mu \leq \mu'$ we have $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu'}(\eta)$, and in particular $\mathrm{rk}_T(\eta) \geq \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta)$*
(2) $\mathrm{rk}_T(\eta) = \cup\{\mathrm{rk}_T(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle) + 1 : \eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle \in T\}$.
(3) $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)}(\langle\rangle) = \alpha$.
(4) *$\underline{If}$ $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \alpha$, $\mu \geq \alpha$ $\underline{then}$ we can embed $\eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ into $T$, so that $\rho \mapsto \rho$ for $\rho \trianglelefteq \eta$.*

*Proof.* 3 The proof is by induction on $\alpha$.
For $\alpha = 0$ this is obvious. Assume correctness for every $\beta < \alpha$. $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha) = \bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} \{\langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu : \nu \in \mathrm{ds}(\beta)\}$. For every $\beta < \alpha, \nu \in \mathrm{ds}(\beta)$ we have $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)}(\langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu) = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\beta)}(\nu)$, therefore (the last equality is due to the induction hypothesis):

$$\begin{aligned}\cup\{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)}(\langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu)+1:\nu\in\mathrm{ds}(\beta)\} &= \cup\{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\beta)}(\nu)+1:\nu\in\mathrm{ds}(\beta)\}\\ &= \mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{ds}(\beta))\\ &= \beta\end{aligned}$$

We therefore have $\mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha))=\cup\{\beta+1:\beta<\alpha\}=\alpha$

4 The proof is by induction on $\alpha$.

For $\alpha=0$ there is nothing to prove.

Assume correctness for every $\beta<\alpha$, and $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta)\geq\alpha$, $\alpha\leq\mu$. For $\beta<\alpha$ let $C_\beta=\{\gamma:\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle)\geq\beta\}$, so $|C_\beta|\geq\mu$ and $C_\beta\subseteq C_{\beta'}$ for $\beta'<\beta<\alpha$. By induction on $\beta<\alpha$ we can choose an increasing sequence of ordinals $\gamma_\beta$ such that $\gamma_\beta=\min\Gamma_\beta$ where $\Gamma_\beta=\{\gamma\in C_\beta:(\forall\beta'<\beta)(\gamma>\gamma_{\beta'})\}$. Assume towards contradiction that $\Gamma_\beta$ is empty, and let $C'_\beta=\langle\gamma_{\beta'}:\beta'<\beta\rangle\cap C_\beta$. For every $\gamma\in C_\beta\backslash C'_\beta$ (and there is such $\gamma$ as $|C_\beta|\geq\mu$ whereas $|C'_\beta|\leq|\beta|<\mu$) as $\gamma\notin\Gamma_\beta$ then there is $\beta'<\beta$ such that $\gamma<\gamma_{\beta'}$, assume $\beta'$ is minimal with this property, but that contradicts the choice of $\gamma_{\beta'}$.

By the induction hypothesis for every $\beta<\alpha$ there is $\varphi_\beta$ which embeds $(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle)^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\beta)$ in $T$ so that $\varphi_\beta\restriction\{\rho:\rho\trianglelefteq\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle\}=Id$. We now define $\varphi_\alpha:\eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)\to T$ in the following manner, if $\rho\trianglelefteq\eta$ then $\varphi_\alpha(\rho)=\rho$, else $\rho=\eta^\frown\nu$ for some $\nu\in\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$, so there is $\beta<\alpha$ such that $\nu=\langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_1$ with $\nu_1\in\mathrm{ds}(\beta)$, and we define

$$\varphi_\alpha(\rho)=\varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_1).$$

$\varphi_\alpha$ obviously preserves level.

For $\rho_1\vartriangleleft\rho_2$ in $\eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ if $\rho_1\trianglelefteq\eta$ then obviously $\varphi_\alpha(\rho_1)\vartriangleleft\varphi_\alpha(\rho_2)$, and otherwise for some $\beta<\alpha$ we have $\rho_i=\eta^\frown\langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_i$, $i\in\{1,2\}$, $\nu_1\vartriangleleft\nu_2\in\mathrm{ds}(\beta)$, and as $\varphi_\beta$ is an embedding we have:

$$\varphi_\alpha(\rho_1)=\varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_1)\vartriangleleft\varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_2)=\varphi_\alpha(\rho_2).$$

For $\rho\in\eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$, $\gamma_1<\gamma_2$ ordinals such that for $i=1,2$ $\rho_i=\rho^\frown\langle\gamma_i\rangle\in\eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$, necessarily $\eta\trianglelefteq\rho$ and there are $\beta_1\leq\beta_2<\alpha$, $\nu_i\in\mathrm{ds}(\beta_i)$ so that $\rho_i=\eta^\frown\langle\beta_i\rangle^\frown\nu_i$. If $\beta_1=\beta_2=\beta$ then $\nu_1<^*_{\ell x}\nu_2$, and as $\varphi_\beta$ is an embedding,

$$\varphi_\alpha(\rho_1)=\varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_1)<^*_{\ell x}\varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_2)=\varphi_\alpha(\rho_2)$$

On the other hand, if $\beta_1\neq\beta_2$ then $\varphi_\alpha(\rho_i)(\lg(\eta))=\gamma_{\beta_i}$, and as $\gamma_{\beta_1}<\gamma_{\beta_2}$, also in this case $\varphi_\alpha(\rho_1)<^*_{\ell x}\varphi_\alpha(\rho_2)$.

By Observation 6 $\varphi_\alpha$ is an embedding, and by definition $\varphi_\alpha\restriction\{\rho:\rho\trianglelefteq\eta\}=Id$.

□

The following theorem was was proved By Komjáth and Shelah in [3]:

**Theorem 10.** *Assume* $\alpha$ *is an ordinal and* $\mu$ *a cardinal. Set* $\lambda=(|\alpha|^{\mu^{\aleph_0}})^+$, *and let* $F:\mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+)\to\mu$. *Then there is an embedding* $\varphi:\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)\to\mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+)$

*and a function* $c : \omega \to \mu$ *such that for every* $\eta \in \mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ *of length* $n+1$

$$F(\varphi(\eta)) = c(n).$$

In what follows we will generalize the above theorem, in the process we will use infinitary logics. For the readers convenience we include the following definitions.

**Definition 11.**

1. For infinite cardinals $\kappa, \lambda$, and a vocabulary $\tau$ consisting of a list of relation and function symbols and their 'arity' which is finite, the infinitary language $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}$ for $\tau$ is defined in a similar manner to first order logic. The first subscript, $\kappa$, indicates that formulas have $< \kappa$ free variables and that we can join together $< \kappa$ formulas by $\bigwedge$ or $\bigvee$, the second subscript, $\lambda$, indicates that we can put $< \lambda$ quantifiers together in a row.
2. Given a structure $\mathfrak{B}$ for $\tau$ we say that $\mathfrak{A}$ is an $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}$-elementary submodel (or substructure), and denote $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa,\lambda} \mathfrak{B}$ or $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}} \mathfrak{B}$, if $\mathfrak{A}$ is a substructure of $\mathfrak{B}$ in the regular manner, and for any $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}$ formula $\varphi$ with $\gamma$ free variables and $\bar{a} \in {}^{\gamma}|\mathfrak{A}|$ we have
$$\mathfrak{B} \models \varphi(\bar{a}) \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{A} \models \varphi(\bar{a}).$$
The Tarski-Vought condition for a substructure $\mathfrak{A}$ of $\mathfrak{B}$ to be an elementary submodel is that for any $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}$-formula $\varphi$ with parameters $\bar{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ we have
$$\mathfrak{B} \models \exists \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}\bar{a}) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{A} \models \exists \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}\bar{a}).$$
3. A set $X$ is transitive if for every $x \in X$ we have $x \subseteq X$.
4. For every set $X$ there exists a minimal transitive set, which is denoted by $TC(X)$, such that $X \subseteq TC(X)$.
5. For an infinite regular cardinal $\kappa$ we define
$$\mathcal{H}(\kappa) = \{X : |TC(X)| < \kappa\}.$$

*Remark* 12. In this paper the main use of infinitary logic will be in the following manner:

1. $\tau$ will consist of the two binary relations $\in$ and $<^*$, so $|\mathbb{L}_{\kappa^+,\kappa^+}(\tau)| = 2^{\kappa}$.
2. If $\kappa' \leq \kappa, \lambda' \leq \lambda$ and $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa,\lambda} \mathfrak{B}$ then also $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa',\lambda'} \mathfrak{B}$.
3. $\prec_{\kappa,\lambda}$ is a transitive relation.
4. For an infinite cardinal $\mu$ let $\kappa = \mu^+$, $\lambda = 2^{\mu}$, so $\kappa$ is regular and $\lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$. Recall that for a structure $\mathfrak{B}$ and $X \subseteq \|\mathfrak{B}\|$ such that $|X| + \tau \leq \lambda \leq \mathfrak{B}$ there is an elementary $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\kappa}$ submodel $\mathfrak{A}$ of $\mathfrak{B}$ of cardinality $\lambda$ which includes $X$.
For further reference on this point see [1].
5. If $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa,\kappa} \mathfrak{B}$ and $x$ is definable in $\mathfrak{B}$ over $\mathfrak{A}$ (i.e with parameters in $\mathfrak{A}$) by an $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\kappa}$-formula, then it is also definable in $\mathfrak{A}$ by the same formula. In particular if $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa,\kappa} \mathfrak{B}$ and $X \subseteq |\mathfrak{A}|, |X| < \kappa$ then $X \in |\mathfrak{A}|$.

**Definition 13.** We say two finite sequence $\langle \eta_\ell : \ell < n \rangle, \langle \nu_\ell : \ell < n \rangle$ are similar when:

(a) $\lg(\eta_\ell) = \lg(\nu_\ell)$ for $\ell < n$.
(b) $\lg(\eta_\ell \cap \eta_m) = \lg(\nu_\ell \cap \nu_m)$ for $\ell, m < n$.
(c) $(\eta_\ell <^2_{\ell x} \eta_m) \equiv (\nu_\ell <^2_{\ell x} \nu_m)$ for $\ell, m < n$ (equivalently, we could use $<^1_{\ell x}$).

**Observation 14.** (1) *Similarity is an equivalence relation and the number of equivalence classes of finite sequences is* $\aleph_0$.
(2) $\langle \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k, \nu' \rangle$, $\langle \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k, \nu'' \rangle$ *are similar if*
  (a) $\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x} \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k$
  (b) $\eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \nu'$
  (c) $\eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \nu''$
  (d) $\lg(\nu') = \lg(\nu'')$
  (e) $\lg(\nu' \cap \eta_k) = \lg(\nu'' \cap \eta_k)$

*Proof.* (1) Similarity is obviously an equivalence relation.
The equivalence class of a finite sequence of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ is determined by its length $n$, the lengths $\langle n_i : i < n \rangle$ of its elements, the lengths $\langle n_{i,j} : i, j < n \rangle$ of their intersections, and a permutation of $n$ (the order of the elements according to $<^1_{\ell x}$). Therefore for each $n < \omega$ there are $\aleph_0$ equivalence classes of sequences of length $n$, and so the number of equivalence classes of finite sequences of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ is $\aleph_0$.

(2) We need to show that $\lg(\nu' \cap \eta_i) = \lg(\nu'' \cap \eta_i)$ for every $0 < i < k$. $\eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \nu'$ and $\eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \nu''$. If $\nu' \triangleleft \eta_k$ then we also have $\lg(\nu'' \cap \eta_k) = \lg(\nu' \cap \eta_k) = \lg(\nu') = \lg(\nu'')$ so $\nu'' \triangleleft \eta_k$, and $\nu' = \nu''$. In this case obviously the required sequences are similar, so we can assume that there is $\ell$ such that $\eta_k \restriction \ell = \nu' \restriction \ell$ and $\nu'(\ell) > \eta_k(\ell)$. By the same reasoning as above we deduce that $\eta_k \restriction \ell = \nu'' \restriction \ell$ and $\nu''(\ell) \neq \eta_k(\ell)$ so necessarily $\nu''(\ell) > \eta_k(\ell)$.

$\square$

The last term we will need before moving on to the main theorem is that of uniformity.

**Definition 15.** Let $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ be a tree, $c : [T]^{<\aleph_0} \to C$. We identify $u \in [T]^{<\aleph_0}$ with the $<^2_{\ell x}$-increasing sequence listing it.

(1) We say $T$ is $c$-uniform if for any similar $u_1, u_2$ in $[T]^{<\aleph_0}$ we have $c(u_1) = c(u_2)$.
(2) We say $T$ is $c$-end-uniform (or end-uniform for $c$) when if $\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x} \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho', \rho''$ are in $T$ and $\lg(\rho') = \lg(\rho''), \lg(\eta_k \cap \rho') = \lg(\eta_k \cap \rho'')$ (equivalently $\langle \eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho' \rangle, \langle \eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho'' \rangle$ are similar-see 4(3))
then $c(\langle \eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho' \rangle) = c(\langle \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k, \rho'' \rangle)$.

(3) We say $T$ is $c$-$n$-end-uniform (or $n$-end-uniform for c) when for $k < \omega$, $\eta_i, \rho'_j, \rho''_j \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ $(0 < i \leq k, 0 < j \leq n)$ such that

$$\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x} < \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho'_1 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \rho'_n$$
$$\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x} < \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho''_1 <^2_{\ell x} < \dots < \rho''_n$$

if those two sequences are similar then

$$c(\langle \eta_1 \dots, \rho'_1 \dots \rangle) = c(\langle \eta_1 \dots \rho''_1 \dots \rangle).$$

We are now ready for the main theorem of this paper.

**Main Claim 16.** *Given a tree $S \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and a cardinal $\mu$ we can find a tree $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ such that*

$(*)_1$ *for every $c : [T]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$ there is $T' \subseteq T$ isomorphic to $S$ such that $c \restriction T'$ is c-end-uniform.*

$(*)_2$ $|T| < \beth_{|S|^+}(|S| + \mu)$.

*Proof.* We assume that $|S|, \mu$ are infinite cardinals since one of our main goals is proving a statement of the form $x \to [y]^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$, otherwise the bound on $T$ has to be slightly adjusted.
For each $\eta \in S$ let

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_\eta = \alpha_S(\eta) = \mathrm{otp}(\{\nu \in S : \nu <^2_{\ell x} \eta\}, <^2_{\ell x}), \\ &\mu_\eta = \beth_{5\alpha_\eta + 1}(|S| + \mu), \\ &\lambda_\eta = \beth_3(\mu_\eta)^+. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mu_{\langle\rangle}, \lambda_{\langle\rangle}$ are the maximal ones, and let $\chi >> \lambda_{<>}$, and $<^*_\chi$ be a well ordering of $\mathcal{H}(\chi)$ (see 11(5)). By definition, for every $\eta, \nu \in S$ such that $\eta <^2_{\ell x} \nu$ we have $\mu_\eta < \mu_\nu$, and $\lambda_\eta < \lambda_\nu$ in the following we examine the relation between $\mu_\nu$ and $\lambda_\eta$ for $\eta \neq \nu$.

**Observation 17.** *For $\eta <^2_{\ell x} \nu$ we have $\mu_\nu \geq \lambda^+_\eta$.*

*Proof.* Since $\alpha_\nu \geq \alpha_\mu + 1$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\nu &= \beth_{5\alpha_\nu + 1}(|S| + \mu) \\ &\geq \beth_{5(\alpha_\eta + 1) + 1}(|S| + \mu) \\ &= \beth_5(\mu_\eta) \\ &\geq \beth_3(\mu_\eta)^{++} \\ &= \lambda^+_\eta \end{aligned}$$

□

let $T := \mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_{\langle\rangle})$, we will show that $T$ is as required. Obviously $T$ meets requirement $(*)_2$, and let $c : [T]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$. Because of the many details in the following construction we bring it as a separate lemma.

**Lemma 18.** *For $\eta \in S$ we can choose $M_\eta$, $T^*_\eta$ and $\nu_{\eta,n} \in T$ for $n < \omega$ with the following properties:*

(1) *$M_\eta$ is an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta, \mu^+_\eta}$-elementary submodel of $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in, <^*_\chi)$.*

(2) $\|M_\eta\| = 2^{\mu_\eta}$.

(3) $S, T, c \in M_\eta$.
(4) $M_\rho, \nu_{\rho,n} \in M_\eta$ *for* $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta$, $n < \omega$.
(5) *Properties of* $T^*_\eta$*:*
  (a) $T^*_\eta = \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}{}^\frown T'$ *where* $T'$ *is isomorphic to* $\mathrm{ds}(2^{2^{\mu_\eta}})$.
  (b) *If* $\nu', \nu'' \in T^*_\eta$ *and are of the same length then they realize the same* $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$*-type over* $M_\eta$.
(6) *Properties of the* $\nu_{\eta,n}$*:*
  (a) $\nu_{\eta,n} \in T$ *is of length* $n$.
  (b) $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)} \in M_\eta$.
  (c) $\lg(\eta) = m < n \Rightarrow \nu_{\eta,n}(m) \notin M_\eta$.
  (d) $\nu_{\eta,n} \in T^*_\eta$, *and for* $n \geq \lg(\eta)$ *has at least* $\mu_\eta$ *immediate successors in* $T^*_\eta$.
(7) *If* $\eta = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle$, *then*
  (a) $M_\eta, T^*_\eta, \nu_{\eta,n} \in M_{\eta_1}$ *for* $n < \omega$.
  (b) $\nu_{\eta_1,n}, \nu_{\eta,n}$ *realize the same* $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$*-type over* $\{M_\rho, \nu_{\rho,n} : n < \omega, \rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta\}$.
  (c) $\nu_{\eta_1,n} = \nu_{\eta,n}$ *for* $n \leq \lg\,(\eta_1)$.
  (d) $\nu_{\eta,n} <^*_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta_1,n}$ *for* $n = \lg(\eta)$.
  (e) $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)} = \nu_{\eta,\lg\eta_1}{}^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle$ *for some* $\gamma$.
  (f) *If* $\eta' = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha'\rangle$ *with* $\alpha' < \alpha$ *then* $\nu_{\eta',\lg(\eta')} <^*_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}$.

*Proof.* We show a construction for such a choice by induction on $<^1_{\ell x}$, yes, $<^1_{\ell x}$ not $<^2_{\ell x}$.

As the induction is on $<^1_{\ell x}$ the base of the induction is the case $\eta = \langle\rangle$. First choose $M_{\langle\rangle} \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle},\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}}} \mathbf{B}$ of cardinality $2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}}$, so that $S, T, c \in M_{\langle\rangle}$ (this can be done, see Remark 12). The number of $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle},\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}}$ formulas $\varphi(\bar x, \bar a)$ where $\bar a \subseteq {}^{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}>}M_{\langle\rangle}$ (sequences of length $< \mu^+_{\langle\rangle}$ in $M_{\langle\rangle}$) is $\leq (2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}})^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}} = 2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}}$ hence the number of $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle},\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}}$-types over $M_{\langle\rangle}$ is at most $\mu' = 2^{2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}}}$, so we colour $T = \mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_{\langle\rangle})$ by $\leq \mu'$ colours, $c_{\langle\rangle} : T \to \mu'$, so that for $\rho \in T$ its colour, $c_{\langle\rangle}(\rho)$, codes the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle},\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}}$-type which $\rho$ realizes in $\mathbf{B}$ over $M_{\langle\rangle}$. As

$$((\beth_2(\mu_{\langle\rangle}))^{\mu'^{\aleph_0}})^+ = \beth_3(\mu_{\langle\rangle})^+ = \lambda_{\langle\rangle}$$

by Theorem 10 there is an embedding of $\mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_{\langle\rangle}))$ in $T$, and define $T^*_{\langle\rangle}$ to be its image, so that types of sequences from $T^*_{\langle\rangle}$ depend only on their length. We choose representatives $\langle \nu_{\langle\rangle,n} : 0 < n < \omega\rangle$ from each level larger than 0 so that for $n > 0$ $\nu_{\langle\rangle,n}$ and has at least $\mu_{\langle\rangle}$ immediate successors in $T^*_{\langle\rangle}$ and satisfies $6(c)$. The latter can be done by cardinality considerations, $\|M_{\langle\rangle}\| = 2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}}$, while the cardinality of levels in $T^*_{\eta_{\langle\rangle}}$ is $\beth_2(\mu_{\langle\rangle})$. We let $\nu_{\langle\rangle,0} = \langle\rangle$.

It is easily verified that for $\eta = \langle\rangle$ all the requirements of the construction are met.

We now show the induction step.
Assume $\eta = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha_1\rangle$, $\lg(\eta_1) = r$, and that we have defined for $\eta_1$ (and below by $<^1_{\ell x}$) and we define for $\eta$.

$\circledast_1$ Let $A_\eta = \{M_\rho, \nu_{\rho,n} : n < \omega, \rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta\}$.

For any $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta$ if $\rho = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle$ for some $\alpha < \alpha_1$ then from requirement $(7)(a)$ of the construction for $\rho$ we have $M_\rho \in M_{\eta_1}$, and also for all $n < \omega$ $\nu_{\rho,n} \in M_{\eta_1}$, else $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta_1$ therefore from requirement (4) of the construction for $\eta_1$ we have for all $n < \omega$ $\nu_{\rho,n} \in M_{\eta_1}$, and $M_\rho \in M_{\eta_1}$. So $A_\eta \subseteq M_{\eta_1}$, and $|A_\eta| \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$, so $A_\eta$ is definable by an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$-formula with parameters in $M_{\eta_1}$, so we have:

$\circledast_2$ $A_\eta \subseteq M_{\eta_1}, |A_\eta| \leq \mu_\eta \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$, therefore $A_\eta \in M_{\eta_1}$.

For every $n < \omega$ let

$\circledast_3$ $\varphi_n(x) = \varphi_{\mu_{\eta_1},n}(x) = \bigwedge($ the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}-$ type which $\nu_{\eta_1,n}$ realizes over $A_\eta)$

And let

$\circledast_4$ $T_\varphi = \{\rho \in T : \mathbf{B} \models \varphi_{\lg(\rho)}(\rho)\}$.

As the cardinality of the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-type of any $\nu \in \mathbf{B}$ over $A_\eta$ is at most $2^{\mu_\eta}$ which is less than $\mu_{\eta_1}$, for every $n < \omega$ we have that $\varphi_n$ is an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$-formula and therefore $T_\varphi$ is definable in $M_{\mu_{\eta_1}}$ by an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$-formula, namely

$$\rho \in T_\varphi \leftrightarrow \Big(\rho \in T \wedge \big(\bigvee_{n<\omega} (\lg(\rho) = n \wedge \varphi_n(\rho))\big)\Big)$$

So

$\circledast_5$ $T_\varphi \in M_{\eta_1}$ and for every $n < \omega$ we obviously have $\nu_{\eta_1,n} \in T_\varphi$.

Recall that for all $n < \omega$ $\nu_{\eta_1,n} \in T^*_{\eta_1}$, so for any $\rho \in T^*_{\eta_1}$ of length $n$, we have that $\rho$ realizes the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$-type over $M_{\eta_1}$ as $\nu_{\eta_1,n}$ so in particular they realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-type over $A_\eta$, so $\rho \in T_\varphi$. For $m \geq n$ $\nu_{\eta_1,n}, \nu_{\eta_1,m}{\restriction}n$ are of the same length, so in particular $\varphi_m(x) \vdash \varphi_n(x{\restriction}n)$. If $\rho \in T_\varphi$, $\lg\rho = m$ so $\mathbf{B} \models \varphi_m(\rho)$ therefore $\mathbf{B} \models \varphi_n(\rho{\restriction}n)$ and therefore also $\rho{\restriction}n \in T_\varphi$. We summarize:

$\circledast_6$ $T_\varphi$ is a subtree of $T$ and $T^*_{\eta_1} \subseteq T_\varphi$.

The following point is a crucial one, we show that:

$\circledast_7$ $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,n}) > \mu_{\eta_1}$ for every $n$ such that $\lg(\eta_1) \leq n < \omega$ .

Assume toward contradiction that $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta,m}) \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$ for some $\lg(\eta_1) \leq m < \omega$, and define for each $n$ such that $m \leq n < \omega$ :

$$\gamma_n = \mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta,n}) \text{ and } \gamma^*_n = \mathrm{rk}^{\mu_{\eta_1}}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,n})$$

(see Definitions 7 and 8). We now prove by induction on $n \geq m$ that $\gamma_{n+1} \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$, i.e $\gamma_n = \gamma^*_n$. For $n = m$ this is our assumption, and assume that it is known for $n$. The following can be expressed by $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$-formulas with parameters in $M_{\eta_1}$ :

$\psi_1$ : '$x$ has $\mathrm{rk}^{\mu_{\eta_1}}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(x) = \gamma_n$'

$\psi_2$ : '$x$ has at least $\mu_{\eta_1}$ immediate successors $y$ in $T_\varphi$ with $\mathrm{rk}^{\mu_{\eta_1}}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(y) \geq \gamma^*_{n+1}$'

We have $\mathbf{B} \models \psi_1(\nu_{\eta_1,n})$, and since $T^*_{\eta_1} \subset T_\varphi$ (see $\circledast_6$) we also have $\mathbf{B} \models \psi_2(\nu_{\eta_1,n})$. By the induction hypothesis for $\eta_1$ we have $\nu_{\eta_1,n}, \nu_{\eta_1,n+1}\restriction n \in T^*_{\eta_1}$ and as they are the same length realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$-type over $M_{\eta_1}$, so $\mathbf{B} \models \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2(\nu_{\eta_1,n+1}\restriction n)$, or in more detail, we have that $\mathrm{rk}^{\mu_{\eta_1}}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,n+1}\restriction n) = \gamma_n$, i.e $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,n+1}\restriction n) = \gamma_n$, and $\nu_{\eta_1,n+1}\restriction n$ has at least $\mu_{\eta_1}$ immediate successors in $T_\varphi$ with reduced rank $\gamma^*_{n+1}$, so by the definition of rank (Definition 7) we have $\gamma_n > \gamma^*_{n+1}$. By the induction hypothesis $\gamma_n \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$, therefore also $\gamma^*_{n+1} = \gamma_{n+1}$. In particular we can deduce that $\gamma_{n+1} < \gamma_n$, so having carried out the induction we have an infinite decreasing sequence of ordinals which is a contradiction.

Recall that $\lg(\eta_1) = r$ so $\lg(\eta) = r + 1$,

$\circledast_8$ Define $\nu_{\eta,\ell} = \nu_{\eta_1,\ell}$ for $\ell \leq r$.

By 17 $\mu_{\eta_1} \geq \lambda^+_\eta$, by $\circledast_7$ $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,r}) > \mu_{\eta_1}$ therefore $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,r}) > \lambda^+_\eta$ so by definition there are $\nu \in \mathrm{Suc}_T(\nu_{\eta_1,r}) \cap T_\varphi$ satisfying $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu) \geq \lambda^+_\eta$, defining $\nu_{\eta,r+1}$ to be one such $\nu$ which is minimal with respect to $<^1_{\ell x}$ (this is equivalent to demanding that $\nu(r)$ is minimal) can be done by an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$ formula. We therefore conclude:

$\circledast_9$ We can choose $\nu_{\eta,r+1} \in \mathrm{Suc}_T(\nu_{\eta_1,r}) \cap T_\varphi \cap M_{\eta_1}$ such that
 $(i)$ $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta,r+1}) \geq \lambda^+_\eta$.
 $(ii)$ $\nu_{\eta,r+1}$ is minimal under $(i)$ in $<^1_{\ell x}$.

As $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)} \in M_{\eta_1} and\ \nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta)}(\lg(\eta_1)) \notin M_{\eta_1}$, we have:

$\circledast_{10}$ $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)} <^1_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta)}$, notice that as they are the same length $<^1_{\ell x} \Rightarrow <^*_{\ell x}$.

Now for any $\rho = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle \in S$ where $\alpha < \alpha_1$ we have that $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta$ and therefore $\nu_{\rho,r+1} \in A_\eta$ (see $\circledast_1$). $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}, \nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta)}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-type over $A_\eta$, and by requirement $(7)(d)$ of the construction for $\rho$ ($\lg(\rho) = \lg(\eta)$) we have $\nu_{\rho,\lg(\eta)} <^1_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta)}$ so also $\nu_{\rho,\lg(\eta)} <^1_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}$ and as above, as they are the same length $<^1_{\ell x} \Rightarrow <^*_{\ell x}$, and we therefore conclude that:

$\circledast_{11}$ If $\rho = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle \in S$ where $\alpha < \alpha_1$ then $\nu_{\rho,\lg(\eta)} <^*_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}$.

Since $|\{S, t, c, \nu_{\eta_{\lg(\eta)}}\} \cup A_\eta| < 2^{\mu_\eta}$ by Remark 12 we can choose $M_\eta$ so that

$\circledast_{12}$ $M_\eta \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}} M_{\eta_1}$, and therefore also $M_\eta \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}} \mathbf{B}$, of cardinality $2^{\mu_\eta}$ and $\{S, t, c, \nu_{\eta_{\lg(\eta)}}\} \cup A_\eta \subseteq M_\eta$.

By the same remark we can conclude that

$\circledast_{13}$ $M_\eta \in M_{\eta_1}$.

Lastly we choose $T^*_\eta$ and $\nu_{\eta,m}$ for $m > \lg(\eta)$.

We have already commented that $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}) > \lambda^+_\eta$, so from Observation 9 we can embed $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}{}^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_\eta)$ into $T_\varphi$ so that $\rho \mapsto \rho$ for $\rho \trianglelefteq \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}$, and denote one such embedding by $\psi$, without loss of generality $\psi \in M_{\eta_1}$.

The number of $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-types over $M_\eta$ is at most $\mu' = 2^{2^{\mu_\eta}}$. We colour

$\mathrm{ds}(\lambda_\eta^+)$ in $\leq \mu'$ colours, the colour of $\rho \in \mathrm{ds}(\lambda_\eta^+)$ is determined by the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_\eta^+,\mu_\eta^+}$-type which $\psi(\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}{}^\frown\rho)$ realizes over $M_\eta$, call this colouring $c_\eta$. As $((\beth_2(\mu_\eta))^{\mu'^{\aleph_0}})^+ = \beth_3(\mu_\eta)^+ = \lambda_\eta$, we can use 10 to get an embedding $\theta$ of $\mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_\eta))$ into $\mathrm{ds}(\lambda_\eta^+)$ so that for $\rho \in \mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_\eta))$ the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_\eta^+,\mu_\eta^+}$-type that $\nu_{\eta,n+1}{}^\frown\theta(\rho)$ realizes over $M_\eta$ depends only on its length. Since the set $X$ of $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_\eta^+,\mu_\eta^+}$-types over $M_\eta$ is in $M_{\eta_1}$ of cardinality at most $\mu' < \mu_{\eta_1}$ we have $X \subset M_{\eta_1}$, also $\mathrm{ds}(\lambda_\eta^+) \in M_{\eta_1}$ so $c_\eta \in M_{\eta_1}$ and therefore without loss of generality $\theta \in M_{\eta_1}$. We define

$\circledast_{14}$ $T_\eta^* = \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}{}^\frown\theta\big(\mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_\eta))\big)$.

$T_\eta^* \in M_{\eta_1}$ and meets requirement (5) of the construction. We will now choose representatives $\langle \rho_m : 0 < m < \omega \rangle$ from each level of $\mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_\eta))$ so that $\nu_{\eta,n+1}{}^\frown\theta(\rho_m)$ has at least $\mu_\eta$ immediate successors in $T_\eta^*$ and $\nu_{\eta,n+1}{}^\frown\theta(\rho_m)(\lg(\eta)) \notin M_{\eta_1}$, since the existence of such representatives in $\mathbf{B}$ can be expressed by an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\eta_1}^+,\mu_{\eta_1}^+}$-formula with parameters in $M_{\eta_1}$ so without loss of generality $\rho_m \in M_{\eta_1}$ and define

$\circledast_{15}$ $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)+m} = \nu_{\eta,n+1}{}^\frown\theta(\rho_m)$.

$T_\eta^*$ is a subtree of $T_\varphi$ therefore $\rho \in T_\eta^*$ realizes the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_\eta^+,\mu_\eta^+}$type over $A_\eta$ as $\nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\rho)}$. The $\nu_{\eta,n}$ for $n > \lg(\eta)$ were chosen to satisfy (6)($c$)-($d$) so in particular they are in $T_\varphi$, and therefore realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_\eta^+,\mu_\eta^+}$-type over $A_\eta$ as $\nu_{\eta_1,n}$. By the induction hypothesis we have already constructed for $\eta_1$ so for all $n$ we have $\lg(\nu_{\eta,n}) = \lg(\nu_{\eta_1,n}) = n$ so also (6)($a$) is satisfied. Requirements (1)-(4) and (6)($b$) of the construction are taken care of by $\circledast_{12}$. $\circledast_7$-$\circledast_{11}$, $\circledast_{13}$ and $\circledast_{15}$ guarantee requirement (7). $\square$

All that is left in order to complete the proof of the claim is to show that $\{\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)} : \eta \in S\}$ is end-uniform with respect to $c$.

Let $\eta_1 <_{\ell x}^2 \eta_2 <_{\ell x}^2 \ldots <_{\ell x}^2 \eta_k <_{\ell x}^2 \rho', \rho''$, be as in 15(2); without loss of generality $\rho' <_{\ell x}^* \rho''$. Let $t = \lg(\rho' \cap \rho'')$, $\mu' = \mu_{\rho'}^+$ and $A = \{\nu_{\rho,\lg\rho} : \rho <_{\ell x}^* \rho' {\restriction} (t+1)\}$. We first show that for every $i \leq k$ $\eta_i <_{\ell x}^* \rho' {\restriction} (t+1)$ so that $\nu_{\eta_i.\lg(\eta_i)} \in A$. As $\eta_i <_{\ell x}^2 \rho'$ and $\lg(\eta_i \cap \rho'') = \lg(\eta_i \cap \rho')$ so $\rho' \ntriangleleft \eta_i$, therefore there is $\ell_i$ such that $\eta_i {\restriction} \ell_i = \rho' {\restriction} \ell_i$ and $\eta_i(\ell_i) < \rho'(\ell_i)$, but then $\eta_i {\restriction} \ell_i = \rho'' {\restriction} \ell_i$ i.e $\rho' {\restriction} \ell_i = \rho'' {\restriction} \ell_i$ so $\ell_i \leq t$ (and $\eta_i(\ell_i) < \rho''(\ell_i)$) and $\eta_i <_{\ell x}^* \rho' {\restriction} (t+1)$.

We now prove by induction on $\ell \in [t, \lg(\rho')]$ that $\nu_{\rho' {\restriction} \ell, \lg\rho'}$ and $\nu_{\rho' {\restriction} t, \lg\rho'}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu',\mu'}$-type over $A$. For $\ell = t$ this is obvious. Let us assume correctness for $\ell$ and prove for $\ell + 1$. For every $n < \omega$ by (7)($b$) of the construction $\nu_{\rho' {\restriction} \ell, n}, \nu_{\rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1), n}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1)}, \mu^+_{\rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1)}}$-type over $\{M_\rho, \nu_{\rho,n} : \rho <_{\ell x}^* \rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1)\}$ and in particular over $A$, for if $\rho <_{\ell x}^* \rho' {\restriction} (t+1)$ then also $\rho <_{\ell x}^* \rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1)$. So $\nu_{\rho' {\restriction} \ell, \lg\rho'}, \nu_{\rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1), \lg\rho}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1)}, \mu^+_{\rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1)}}$-type so also the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu',\mu'}$-type over $A$, and from the induction hypothesis $\nu_{\rho' {\restriction} t, \lg\rho'}$ and $\nu_{\rho' {\restriction} \ell, \lg\rho'}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu',\mu'}$-type over $A$. Similarly we show for $\rho''$, so $\nu_{\rho',\lg\rho'}$ and $\nu_{\rho'',\lg\rho''}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\eta_1}^+,\mu_{\eta_1}^+}$-type over $A$.

From the above we can deduce that in particular

$$c(\langle \nu_{\eta_1,\mathrm{lg}(\eta_1)}, \dots, \nu_{\eta_k,\mathrm{lg}(\eta_k)}, \nu_{\rho',\mathrm{lg}(\rho')}\rangle) = c(\langle \nu_{\eta_1,\mathrm{lg}(\eta_1)}, \dots, \nu_{\eta_k,\mathrm{lg}(\eta_k)}, \nu_{\rho'',\mathrm{lg}(\rho'')}\rangle).$$

$\square$

*Conclusion* 19. Given a tree $S \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and $n(*) < \omega$ and $\mu$ we can find a tree $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ such that:

- $(*)_1$ For every $c : [T]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$ there is $S' \subseteq T$ isomorphic to $S$ such that $S'$ is $n(*)$-end-uniform for $c$.
- $(*)_2$ In particular, for every $c : [T]^{n(*)} \to \mu$ is $S' \subseteq T$ isomorphic to $S$ such that $c{\restriction}S'$ depends only on the equivalence classes of the equivalence relation defined in 13.
- $(*)_3$ $|T| < \beth_{1,n(*)}(|S|, \mu)$ (see Definition 20 below).

*Proof.* Let $S$, $\mu$ be as above. Since for $|S|, \mu \geq \aleph_0$ we have that $\beth_{1,n(*)}(|S|, \mu^{\aleph_0}) = \beth_{1,n(*)}(|S|, \mu)$, replacing $\mu$ with $\mu^{\aleph_0}$ gives the same bound, and we can therefore assume that $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0}$.
Let $\langle h_n : n < \omega\rangle$ be the equivalence classes of the similarity relationship on finite sequences of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ (see 14(1)), and let $f : {}^{\omega}(\mu \cup \{-1\}) \to \mu$ be one-to-one and onto.
We construct by induction a sequence $\langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle$ so that $T_0 = S$, and for every $n > 0$:

- $(a)$ $|T_n| < \beth_{1,n}(|S|, \mu)$
- $(b)$ $T_{n-1}, T_n, \mu$ correspond to $S, T, \mu$ in Theorem 16.
- $(c)$ For every $c : [T_n]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$ there is $S' \subseteq T_n$ isomorphic to $S$ such that $S'$ is $n$-end-uniform for $c$.

By Theorem 16 we can obviously construct such a sequence satisfying clauses $(a), (b)$, We will show by induction on $n$ that for this sequence also clause $(c)$ holds. For $n = 1$ this is Theorem 16. Assume correctness for $n$ and let $c : [T_{n+1}]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$. By $(b)$ there is $T' \subseteq T_{n+1}$ isomorphic to $T_n$ so that $T'$ is end-uniform for c. Let $\varphi : T_n \to T'$ be an isomorphism and let $d : [T']^{<\aleph_0} \to {}^{\omega}(\mu \cup \{-1\})$ as follows: for $\bar\rho = \langle \rho_1 \dots \rho_k\rangle$ where $\rho_1 <^2_{\ell x} \rho_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \rho_k$ and $m < \omega$

$$d(\bar\rho)(m) = \begin{cases} c(\bar\rho^\frown\langle\eta\rangle) & \text{if } \bar\rho^\frown\langle\eta\rangle \in h_m \text{ for some } \eta \\ \text{-1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$d$ is well defined as $T'$ is end-uniform for $c$, and by defining $\varphi(\rho_1, \dots \rho_k) = (\varphi(\rho_1), \dots \varphi(\rho_k))$ for $\rho_1, \dots \rho_k \in T_n$ we have $f \circ d \circ \varphi : [T_n]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$, so by the induction hypothesis there is $T'' \subseteq T_n$ isomorphic to $S$ so that $T''$ is $n$-end-uniform for $f \circ d \circ \varphi$. We claim that $S' = \varphi(T'')$ is isomorphic to $S$ and that $S'$ is $n+1$-end-uniform for $c$. As $T''$ is isomorphic to $S$ and $\varphi$ is an isomorphism $S'$ is obviously isomorphic to $S$. Let the following sequences in $S'$ be similar,

$$\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x}< \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho'_1 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \rho'_{n+1}$$

$$\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x}< \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho''_1 <^2_{\ell x}< \dots < \rho''_{n+1}$$

So in $T''$ the following sequences are similar:

$$\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1 \dots \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_n) = (\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1)\varphi^{-1}(\rho'_1) \dots \varphi^{-1}(\rho'_n))$$

$$\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1 \dots \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_n) = (\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1)\varphi^{-1}(\rho''_1) \dots \varphi^{-1}(\rho''_n))$$

so $f \circ d \circ \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_n)) = f \circ d \circ \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_n))$. Therefore we have $f(d(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_n)) = f(d(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_n))$, and as $f$ is one-to-one, $d(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_n) = d(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_n)$, and therefore $c(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_{n+1}) = c(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_{n+1})$, and $(*)_1$-$(*)_3$ are easily verified. □

**Definition 20.** For cardinals $\lambda \geq \aleph_0$ and $\mu$ define $\beth_{1,\alpha}(\lambda, \mu)$ by induction on $\alpha$. $\beth_{1,0}(\lambda, \mu) = \beth_0(\lambda) = \lambda$, $\beth_{1,\alpha+1}(\lambda, \mu) = \beth_{\beth_{1,\alpha}(\lambda,\mu)^+}(\beth_{1,\alpha}(\lambda, \mu) + \mu)$, and for a limit ordinal $\alpha$ $\beth_{1,\alpha}(\lambda, \mu) = \sum\limits_{\beta<\alpha} \beth_{1,\beta}(\lambda, \mu)$.

We end with a conclusion for scattered order types.

*Conclusion* 21. For a scattered order type $\varphi$, a cardinal $\mu$ and $n < \omega$, there is a scattered order type $\psi$ so that $\psi \to (\varphi)^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$.

*Proof.* Given a scattered order type $\varphi$, a cardinal $\mu$ and $n < \omega$ by Observation 4(3) we can embed $\varphi$ in $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3)$ for some ordinal $\alpha$. By Conclusion 19$(*)_2$ above there is an ordinal $\lambda$ and a tree $T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\lambda)$ so that for every colouring $c : T^n \to \mu$ there is a subtree $S \subseteq T$ isomorphic to $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ so that $c{\restriction}S$ depends only on the equivalence class of similarity. Noting the above Observation, as $(T, <^3)$ is a scattered order, and as there are only $\aleph_0$ equivalence classes, we are done. □

## References

[1] M. A. Dickman, *Larger infinitary languages*, Model Theoretic Logics (J. Barwise and S. Feferman, eds.), Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer-Verlag, New York Berlin Heidelberg Tokyo, 1985, pp. 317–364.

[2] F. Hausdorff, *Grundzüge einer Theorie der geordneten Mengen*, Math. Ann. **65** (1908), no. 4, 435–505. MR MR1511478

[3] Péter Komjáth and Saharon Shelah, *A partition theorem for scattered order types*, Combinatorics Probability and Computing **12** (2003, no.5-6), 621–626, Special issue on Ramsey theory. math.LO/0212022.

[4] Joseph G. Rosenstein, *Linear orderings*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 98, Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York, 1982. MR MR662564 (84m:06001)

Institute of Mathematics The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem 91904, Israel. `e-mail: esth@math.huji.ac.il`

Institute of Mathematics The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem 91904, Israel and Department of Mathematics Rutgers University New Brunswick, NJ 08854, USA `e-mail: shelah@math.huji.ac.il`